

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 23 2007**

Attorney Docket No. E0523-00070

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Supplemental Response is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed 08/25/2006, Advisory Action mailed 12/01/2006 and further to the telephonic interview between Examiner Canning, Primary Examiner Santiago and Applicants' undersigned representative Mark J. Marcelli, that took place on January 10, 2007.

First and foremost, Applicants take this opportunity to thank Examiner Canning and Primary Examiner Santiago for the opportunity for their undersigned representative to discuss this application in said telephonic interview.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 21-25 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1-6, 8, 15-17 and 19 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 10-13 and 21-25 were rejected in the August 25, 2006 Office action.

Following is the agenda supplied to the Examiner for the Examiner Interview on January 10, 2007. Responsive to Examiner Canning's request to make the Agenda "of-record", Applicants provide the Agenda as below.

**Agenda for Examiner Interview on January 10, 2007****35 U.S.C. §102 rejections**

Izumizawa clearly and expressly states that **anode 2 and cathode 4** are electrodes of the organic EL device and that **preliminary moisture reaction layer 10** is provided so as to prevent intrusion of moisture into the organic EL device. (Col. 7, Lines 8-12). The Examiner alleges that preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 is an electrode by simply stating that preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 can be conductive. Applicants submit that not every conductive layer is an electrode. An electrode is a conductive layer from which a voltage is applied to an EL device for luminescence. Clearly, preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 is provided so as to prevent intrusion of moisture, and not to provide a voltage to the organic EL device for luminescence. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art based on Izumizawa as a whole would not characterize preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 as an electrode.

## Attorney Docket No. E0523-00070

Further, Izumizawa clearly states that when the amount of the water-reactive substance increases, preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 becomes conductive. Izumizawa also states that such a preliminary moisture reaction layer undesirably causes short circuits between the layer and the anode 2 when the preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 and the anode 2 are in contact with each other as shown in FIG. 7. Therefore, the amount of the water-reactive substance must be adjusted so as to fall within the range in which the preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 maintains the insulation property. (Col. 7, Lines 44-53). Accordingly, Izumizawa teaches against the preliminary moisture reaction layer 10 becoming conductive as such conductivity undesirably causes shorting. (Col. 7, Lines 40-52 and Col. 8, Lines 11-18).

Accordingly, Izumizawa fails to teach or suggest the moisture detector including a material layer comprising metal formed between a first electrode and a second electrode. The 102 rejection of Claim 10 therefore should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 rejections

As conceded by the Action, Kobayashi fails to teach or suggest that the material layer comprising metal is formed between a first electrode and a second electrode. Indeed, Kobayashi uses indicator 50, i.e., an organic or inorganic material layer, which produces a **color change** by absorbing moisture to determine a level of moisture in closure space 26 (Paragraphs [0012] and [0013]). Clearly, indicator 50 should **NOT** be covered by an electrode, or the color change of indicator 50 cannot be visible through glass substrate 10 as shown in FIGS. 1(a), 2(a), 4(a), 5(a) and 6(a). If indicator 50, i.e. the inorganic material layer, is formed between two electrodes, the electrodes will **block the color change** of the inorganic material layer to users. In other words, the alleged formation of the material layer between two electrodes will ruin the function of indicator 50 provided in an OLED display.

The Examiner also contended that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Kobayashi's device in view of Sudoh for the benefit of low manufacturing costs. Kobayashi **only** uses an organic or inorganic material layer as indicator 50. If indicator 50 is formed between two electrodes, additional, complicated

Attorney Docket No. E0523-00070

processing steps are required to sequentially form the first electrode/material layer/second electrode structure and to etch the structure. Accordingly, the costs of forming indicator 50 between two electrodes will be **enhanced**, instead of being reduced. Based on these reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to form indicator 50 between two electrodes as shown in Sudoh. Accordingly, Claim 10 is not obvious over the combined teachings of Kobayashi and Sudoh and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. The 103 rejection of Claim 10 should be withdrawn.

**End of the Agenda**

Applicants thank Examiner Canning and Primary Examiner Santiago, in the Interview Summary received by Applicants on January 10, 2007, for expressly stating that the rejections of claims 10-13 and 22-25 under sections 102 and 103 and based upon Izumizawa, Kobayashi and Sudoh are **WITHDRAWN**. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that each of Claims 10-13 and 22-25 is in allowable form.

**Claim 21**

The previous Action failed to object to or reject Claim 21. Claim 21 thus is allowable.

Further, Claim 21 depends from Claim 10 and is therefore distinguished from the art of record via virtue of dependency.

JAN 23 2007

Attorney Docket No. E0523-00070

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication, to Deposit Account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Marcelli, Reg. No. 36,593  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: January 23, 2007

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
101 West Broadway, Suite 900  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 744-2200  
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201